Interview Summary	Application No. 09/356,926	Applicant(s) Van Ooij et al.
	Examiner LA VILLA	Art Unit 1775

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) *LA VILLA*   (3) _____

(2) *Mr. Oberhauser, Attny.*   (4) _____

Date of Interview _____ *Jan 13, 2003* _____

Type: a)☒ Telephonic   b)☐ Video Conference
        c)☐ Personal [copy is given to   1)☐ applicant   2)☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d)☐ Yes   e)☒ No. If yes, brief description:

_____

_____

Claim(s) discussed: *No claims were specifically discussed* _____

Identification of prior art discussed:
Brown USP 6,071,566 _____

_____

Agreement with respect to the claims   f)☐ was reached.   g)☒ was not reached.   h)☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:
No agreement as to patentability of claims was reached. Applicant explained that Examiner had previously acknowledged that claims would likely be allowable, but rejection was provided for nevertheless. Applicant explained that Brown's 14 day test is not comparable to applicant's. Applicant explained that Brown's "spray test" is undefined in contradistinction to applicant's specific designation of an ASTM test. Applicant believes the "spray test" results of Brown may not be comparable to applicant's. Examiner pointed out that the BTSE/VS example of applicant appears to be conducted with solvent and pH conditions different from applicant's experiments on inventive compositions. Examiner suggested that comparisons should be provided with all conditions the same except for compositional variation that is to be demonstrated.

_____

_____

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

   i)☐   It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

_____
Examiner's signature, if required